Diplomatic culture in early modern Rome

Toby Osborne

On his way to the papal capital in 1599, the duke of Savoy's newly appointed ambassador to Rome, the count of Verrua (1561-1619), recorded his concern at arriving "without a household, without horses, coaches and furnishings." His determination, though, was undiminished, as he pressed on, confident that he would obtain the necessary resources "to open and maintain your residence in Rome, Theater of all Christendom."[1] It was a cliché for an ambassador to complain about being impecunious: lack of money, or delays in payments of expenses, were the lot of early modern diplomats. It was just as much of a cliché to see Rome as a theater, indeed the "theater of the world". This language played on ideas of papal authority and the pope as a diplomatic actor, but it also pointedly resonated with Rome's importance. Throughout the early modern period, Rome was one of Europe's premier diplomatic hubs, a venue of innovation in diplomatic practice, magnificent display, and intense--even violent--competition. Another Savoyard ambassador put it neatly in a letter written in 1592:

> All interests of war or peace, not only in Italy but in Christendom, depend on the court of Rome. For all princes, either Italian or otherwise, who have an inclination to arms, or thoughts of some grand design, have sought to have the pope in their favor, or at least not hostile…this court may be considered a register of all affairs of state [un registro di tutti li maneggi di stato].[2]

[1] Archivio di Stato, Turin [AST] Lettere Ministri Roma [LMR], m. 18 fasc. 3, 17, Verrua to Carlo Emanuele I, 18/01/1599.

[2] AST LMR m. 12, fasc. 3, 32, Germonio to Catalina Michaela, 01/02/1592.

Accordingly, this chapter examines ways in which Rome retained its importance in diplomacy for much of the 16th and 17th centuries, though it also explores how similar Rome was to other European court capitals. It will do so by approaching diplomacy in two senses: the formal and, for want of a better term, the "informal".

Formal diplomacy

In terms of formal diplomacy--diplomacy conducted through accredited representatives of recognized sovereign powers--the essay addresses important debates about the emergence of resident embassies.[3] It furthermore challenges the prevalent notion that the papacy declined as a significant diplomatic actor during this period, a belief based on the idea that Latin Christendom as a single diplomatic community was shattered from the late Middle Ages. This narrative argues that secular powers paid diminishing regard for supranational powers--the papacy and the Holy Roman Emperor--as they pursued their discrete ambitions in Europe and beyond. Concurrently, the Reformation marked the breakdown of shared diplomatic norms among Christians.[4] Certainly, Protestant powers almost universally denied Rome's

---

[3] Most obviously, G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (London, 1955). See also the important essays by Ricardo Fubini, for example, 'La 'résidentalité' de l'ambassadeur dans le mythe et dans la réalité: une enquête sur les origins', in L. Bély (ed.), *L'invention de la diplomatie, – Moyen age–temps modernes* (Paris, 1998), 27-35. More recently, Fletcher, 2015.

[4] E. g., W. G. Grewe, *The Epochs of International Law* (Berlin, 2000 ed).

authority, effectively precluding any formal diplomatic contact on their part, and the papacy remained equally hostile, at least publicly, towards "heretical" Protestant powers.[5] There were, to my knowledge, no official diplomatic missions of full ambassadorial status from Protestant powers to Papal Rome until the early nineteenth century (as opposed to lesser missions involving envoys operating below the ambassadorial level).

Nor did Europe's Catholic powers always maintain formal diplomatic representatives in the papal capital, sometimes refraining from sending ambassadors at certain moments and for periods of time. When, for example, relations between the Holy Roman Emperor and Rome were strained, imperial ambassadors were absent.[6] Whatever historiographical claims are made about resident embassies and the inexorable spread of a supposedly Italian culture of permanent diplomacy from the later 1400s, European sovereigns always made calculations

[5] Most famously demonstrated by the refusal of the papal nuncio Fabio Chigi (the future Pope Innocent X) to meet Dutch plenipotentiaries at the Münster peace talks in 1648. K. Repgen "Die Proteste Chigis und der päpstliche Protest gegen den Westfälischen Frieden (1648/50)," in his collection, *Dreissigjähriger Krieg und Westfälischer Friede* (Paderborn, 1998).

[6] A. Koller, "La rappresentanza imperiale a Roma intorno al 1600. Una panoramica," in I. Fosi and A. Koller (eds.), *Papato e impero nel pontificato di Urbano VIII (1623-44*) (The Vatican, 2013), 105-26. In the absence of formal ambassadors, the emperor could nonetheless turn to the Savelli family, one of Rome's old baronial clans, to represent his interests more informally.

about where to send ambassadors based on the financial costs of maintaining a formal diplomatic presence as well as exigencies regarding political desirability.

Nevertheless, Rome had a fundamental place in the geography of early modern diplomacy. No other court capital was a venue of such intense and sustained diplomatic practice. Most Italian powers, for example, maintained nearly permanent representation there. The city's significance is further ascertained by the costs of diplomacy. During the 16th century, Spanish ambassadors there enjoyed the highest salaries of all the Catholic King's diplomats--even higher than those at the imperial court.[7] So, too, in 1685, French ambassadors in Rome received the highest financial budget from the monarchy.[8] Nor was diplomatic representation in Rome limited to what we today might recognize as "state" powers. By the 17th century, Bologna and Ferrara, although part of the Papal States, were each allowed to send representatives, and the Grand Master of the Knights of Malta also maintained a diplomatic presence.

[7] M. J. Levin, *Agents of Empire. Spanish Ambassadors in Sixteenth Century Italy* (New York, 2005). However, even Spanish ambassadors in Rome faced the kinds of financial insecurity that bedevilled most early modern diplomats: S. Giordano, (ed.), *Istruzioni di Filippo III ai suoi ambasciatori a Roma 1598-1621* (Rome, 2006), XCI-CI; Giordano, 2008, 1030-32.

[8] On the high value, but high costs of serving in Rome from a French perspective, see Poncet, 2011, 237-9.

From the 16th century, the papal court also received "ambassadorial" visitors from Africa and Asia, reflecting the global pretensions of the papacy as the authoritative Christian power over rival confessions. Some of these non-European representatives were themselves Christian, or Christianized,[9] most famously the Congolese Emanuele ne Vunda, who arrived in Rome on 2 January 1608 and died there only three days later. The papacy also welcomed non-Europeans who might afford opportunities for the evangelization of their natal, non-Christian, homelands and propaganda for the papacy, exemplified by the Japanese delegation's visit in 1585 during the pontificates of Gregory XIII (r.1572-1585) and Sixtus V (r.1585-90). Not a formal diplomatic mission in the conventional sense, it consisted of a number of youths under the charge of Alessandro Valignano (1539-1606), the visitor to the Jesuit missions in east Asia (though he did not travel with them). They were nevertheless treated with the kinds of protocols usually accorded to princely or ambassadorial visitors. The aim of their European trip was twofold for Valignano: to impress on Europe (and on the pope) the efforts of the Jesuits in the field; and to demonstrate to the Japanese the authority of the Roman Church. A contemporary record detailing their journey from Japan to Goa, then to Portugal, Spain, and the Italian peninsula, noted the ostentation of their reception in Rome, where Gregory XIII received them not in private, but in a public consistory in the Sala Regia, the ceremonial space in the Vatican Palace usually reserved for receiving royalty or royal ambassadors.[10] Another mission from Japan, the so-called Hasekura delegation of 1615, was

[9] Lowe, 2001, 101-28.

[10] Guido Gualtieri, *Relationi della venuta degli ambasciatori giapponesi a Roma sino alla partita di Lisbona* (Venice, 1586); D. Massarella, (ed.), *Japanese Travellers in Sixteenth-*

similarly received by Pope Paul V, with a private audience in the Quirinal Palace, followed by a public audience in the Vatican's Sala Clementina. On this occasion, the Sala Regia was not used since the delegation was deemed to be representing a feudal lord, not a sovereign. Nevertheless, their presence in Rome served to underscore the pope's global authority. Paul was evidently keen to emphasize the importance of this "mission": it was commemorated in fresco in the Quirinal Palace's Sala Regia, as was Robert Shirley's delegation of 1617 on behalf of the Persian Shah Abbas (r.1588-1629).[11]

What did accredited European ambassadors do in Rome? Like diplomats elsewhere, they were typically ranked according to the natures of their missions. "Extraordinary ambassadors", usually laymen of high social status, came for moments of particular importance to their sovereigns, such as bringing official news of princely births and marriages or congratulating popes on their elections. So, too, "ambassadors of obedience", particular to Rome, were dispatched to pay homage to popes. For Holy Roman Emperors, this practice became increasingly problematic. After the 1555 Augsburg Settlement effectively accepted the legitimacy of Lutheran imperial powers under their feudal authority,

---

Century Europe. A Dialogue Concerning the Mission of the Japanese Ambassadors to the Roman Curia (1590) (Farnham, 2012).

[11] Opher Mansour, "Picturing global conversion: art and diplomacy at the court of Paul V (1605-1621)," *Journal of Early Modern History*, 17 (2013), pp. 525-59; Musillo, 2016, 165-180, and Fujikawa, 2016, 181-202.

sending "ambassadors of obedience" to Rome questions were inevitably raised about whether the emperors could submit to papal authority on behalf of imperial Protestants as fief-holders. Rudolf II (r.1576-1612) was especially concerned about the semantics. Was he in effect subjecting his patrimonial territories to the pope, or was his act of obedience purely personal, as he preferred? The last imperial representative to perform an act of obedience was Johann Anton von Eggenberg (1610-49) on behalf of Emperor Ferdinand III (r.1637-57), to Pope Urban VIII (r.1624-43) in 1638.[12]

The 16th century also witnessed the gradual emergence across Europe of "ordinary ambassadors", individuals who resided abroad for longer periods. Rome was no exception, though we should be cautious about assuming that permanent embassy buildings with an independent existence concurrently appeared. Most ambassadors in Rome, as was true of ambassadors across Europe, rented their accommodation. The Orsini palace complex at Montegiordano was, for example, commonly used across the period for resident diplomats.[13] Nevertheless, Rome pre-empted European practice by some distance when it came to embassy buildings. The Spanish led the way, acquiring a permanent residence in 1647 when

[12] On Rudolf II's dilemma see Koller, 2012, Chapter 6. See also P. Rietbergen, *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome. Barberini Cultural Politics* (Leiden, 2006), Chapter Four.

[13] For example, Fletcher, 2015, 133-37.

the Count of Oñate (1597-1658) was granted permission to buy the Palazzo Monaldeschi;[14] it was effectively remodelled from 1653 to designs by the Roman architect Antonio del Grande (1625-71) and possibly Francesco Borromini (1599-1667), and still serves as Spain's embassy to the Holy See. Not wishing to be left behind, from 1661, when the Duke of Créquy (1623-87) was in Rome as Louis XIV's ambassador, the French became inalienably associated with the Palazzo Farnese (which remains the French embassy to the Italian state).[15] The confidence of the French in Rome during the second half of the 17th century can be measured by their attempts to assert immunity over the buildings in the Palazzo's vicinity, reflecting also the political sensitivities surrounding diplomatic immunity more generally. The notion of the diplomatic "*quartier*" [quarter] itself became a sticking point in relations between Louis XIV and Pope Innocent XI (r.1676-89) as they clashed over Louis's claims to ecclesiastical rights in France, resulting in, the pope issued a bull against *quartiers* in Rome

[14] Thomas Dandelet, 'Setting the Noble Stage in Baroque Rome: Roman Palaces, Political Contest, and Social Theatre, 1600-1700', in *Life and the Arts in the Baroque Palaces of Rome*, *Ambiente Barocco* (New Haven, 1999), 46. On Spain's search for a permanent embassy before 1647 see Giordano, 2006, CI-CIII.

[15] B. Neveu, "'Regia Fortuna': le Palais Farnèse durant le seconde moitié du XVIIe siècle," in *Le Palais Farnèse*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1981), I, 475-507.

in 1687.[16] It should be emphasized that the two 17th-century Roman embassies of Spain and France were the first of their kind anywhere in Europe.

The location of Spain's permanent ambassadorial residence both reflected and enhanced the area's associations with their national community in the city--the Piazza di Spagna assumed its name as a consequence, and the Spanish furthermore sought to extend rights of diplomatic immunity in the area, as the French were to do with their *quartier*.[17] These points raise broader issues that deserve more scrutiny, notably the political, social, cultural, and economic impacts ambassadors and other categories of national representatives had on Rome. For example, though scholarship has partially addressed the roles played by national churches in this regard, it is noteworthy that they performed some of the functions corresponding to those of consulates today, such as providing material support for pilgrims and for nationals visiting the court capital. National churches were also cultural hubs and

[16] F. de Bojani, "L'affaire du 'quartier' à Rome à la fin du dix-septième siècle. Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège," *Revue d'histoire diplomatique*, 22 (1908), 350-378.

[17] A. Anselmi, "Il Quartiere del Ambasciata di Spagna a Roma," in D. Calabi and P. Lanaro (eds.), *La citta italiana e i luoghi degli stranieri XIV-XVIII secolo* (Rome, Bari, 1998), 206-221; Maximiliano Barrio Gonzalo, "El barrio de la embajada de España en Roma en la segunda mitad del siglo XVII," *Hispania. Revista Española de Historia*, LXVII (2007), 993-1024.

focal points for moments of dynastic or "national" celebration in Rome, again serving broader diplomatic functions through their visibility.[18]

Returning to the duties of accredited representatives, ordinary ambassadors in Rome engaged in routine (though not unimportant) tasks, such as collecting information, negotiating, managing their sovereigns' ecclesiastical interests, not least during conclaves, treating with their sovereigns' subjects in the curia, or pushing for ecclesiastical promotions, most importantly to the cardinals' college. These negotiations might themselves be enmeshed with the micropolitical interactions with members of papal families, especially papal nephews, blurring boundaries between what might constitute "state" service and more personal and informal diplomacy.[19] Indeed, there are numerous examples of ambassadors cultivating and maintaining networks of supporters in Rome through the distribution of pensions and gifts, especially to cardinals and members of the curia, and even to other

[18] F. C. Uginet, "L'idee de 'natio gallicana' et la fin de la presence savoisienne dans l'eglise nationale de Saint-Louis à Rome," in *Les fondations nationales dans la Rome pontificale. Actes du colloque de Rome (16-19 mai 1978)* (Rome, 1981), 83-99; S. Roberto, *San Luigi dei Francesi. La fabbrica di una chiesa nazionale nella Roma del '500* (Rome, 2005).

[19] E.g., T. Mörschel, *Buona amicitia? Die römisch-savoyischen beziehungen unter Paul V. (1605-1621). Studien zur frühneuzeitlichen mikropolitik in italien* (Mainz, 2002), and C. Wieland, *Fürsten, Freunde, Diplomaten. Die römisch-florentinischen Beziehungen unter Paul V. (1605-1621)* (Cologne, 2004).

ambassadors. Henry IV of France, for instance, doled out pensions to various supportive cardinals and members of the curia via his ambassadors; the same was true of the Spanish monarchy throughout the period.[20] The need to maintain the support of cardinals is demonstrated in instructions given to a Tuscan secretary in 1606, which included no fewer than 47 complimentary letters to be distributed to named cardinals in the papal capital.[21] Another Medici representative, Piero Guicciardini (1560-1626), wrote in 1612 of receiving a shipment of 2,600 oysters from Livorno, which he delivered to various cardinals, including 500 to the cardinal-nephew, Scipione Borghese, 200 to other cardinals, as well as 200 each to the Spanish and French ambassadors and their wives (how the oysters stayed fresh is not clear).[22]

That the gift was given to both ambassadors and their wives is significant. Ordinary ambassadorial missions might provide broader social and cultural functions for ambassadors themselves. Staff operating as diplomats might travel with family members, including wives and children. In this respect, Rome, undoubtedly one of the most important postings for a diplomat in Catholic Europe, could provide an excellent training ground for the world of

[20] Barbiche, 2007, 519-33; Visceglia, 2010,

[21] Archivio di Stato, Florence, Mediceo del Principato [ASF MP], 23-35, instructions to Rena, 24/02/1606, with letters to various cardinals.

[22] ASF MP 3327, fol. 195, Guicciardini to Vinta, 20/04/1612.

court politics. For example, an ordinary ambassador of Savoy, Alessandro Scaglia (1592-1641), brought his four nephews with him to Rome, clearly with a didactic intention.[23] His own father, the count of Verrua (mentioned at the beginning of this essay), had also served as Savoy's ordinary ambassador and may well have secured the son's posting there at the age of 22.[24]

Rome was also among Europe's most important markets for buying or commissioning works of art and other material products, and this too comprised an important aspect of many resident ambassadors' work. Cultures of collecting in Rome are discussed elsewhere in this volume, though it should be emphasized here that ambassadors' commissioning or acquisition of material objects was partly driven by their own competitive instincts and those of their princely collectors. This points, in turn, to another important facet of ambassadorial life in Rome, ceremonial rivalry, itself a symptom of a wider phenomenon of European diplomatic practice--the growing frequency of contact between resident ambassadors and the increasingly close identification of ambassadors as the embodiments of their legitimate sovereigns. Formal ambassadorial representation in effect was about princes meeting in

[23] Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Avvisi, 8, fol. 355v, Rome, 14/11/1618; fol. 372v, Rome, 21/11/1618.

[24] Verrua was the probable author of a conventional didactic treatise on court life, drawing on his experiences as an ambassador in Rome. D. Carrutti (ed.), "Avvertimenti politici per quelli che vogliono entrare in corte," *Miscellanea di storia italiana*, I (1862), 321-71.

proxy. Accordingly, Europe's powers were acutely sensitive to diplomacy's symbolic functions, and in this respect, Rome was probably Europe's most important court capital for the performances of sovereignty through diplomatic practice.[25] That so many Catholic powers maintained almost permanent representation in Rome was a function of its persistent importance.

The regulations governing ambassadorial conduct at the papal court set the standard for much of Europe. For historians, they serve as another metric of Rome's significance in European diplomatic practice. In 1504, under Julius II (r.1503-13), the Master of Ceremonies, Paride de Grassis (c.1470-1528), defined the order of precedence for papal ceremonies in a document that became one of the most influential statements of international protocol throughout Europe and remained a potent force.[26] Grassis' *Ordo Regum et Ducum* (The Order

[25] Visceglia, 2002, Chapter III; Visceglia, 1997. More generally see P. Gribaudi, "Questioni di precedenza fra le Corti italiane nel secolo XVI. Contributo alla storia della diplomazia italiana," *Rivista di Scienze Storiche* I (1904), 166-177, 278-285, 347-356; II, (1905), 1: 87-94, 205-216, 475-485.; II, (1905), 2: 29-38, 126-141.

[26] On the roles played by Masters of Ceremonies in Rome consult G. Constant, "Les Maîtres de Cérémonies du XVIe siècle," *Mélanges d' archéologie et d'histoire*, 23 (1903), 319-343. Their diaries afford important sources of evidence for historians into diplomatic ceremonial at the papal court. E.g., Wassilowsky and Wolf, 2007; Jennifer Mara DeSilva, "Appropriating Sacred Space: Private Chapel Patronage and Institutional Identity in Sixteenth-century Rome – the Case of the Office of Ceremonies," *The Catholic Historical Review*, 97, 653-78.

of Kings and Dukes) listed Europe's powers hierarchically, starting, in the *Ordo Regum* with the Holy Roman Emperor, followed by the King of the Romans (his designated heir), then the kings of France, Spain, Aragon, Portugal, England, Sicily, Scotland, Hungary, Navarre, Cyprus, Bohemia, Poland, and Denmark. The second part of the protocol, the *Ordo Ducum*, did the same for those below royal status, listing, in order, the dukes of Brittany and Burgundy, Elector Palatine, duke of Saxony, marquis of Brandenburg, dukes of Austria, Savoy, and Milan, doge of Venice, dukes of Bavaria and Lorraine, the dukes of Bourbon and Orleans, doge of Genoa, and duke of Ferrara.

Commented [BW1]: Is Naples not mentioned together with the Two Sicilies? NO – Toby.

The protocol, reflective of the growth of diplomatic business in early 16th-century Rome, also reveals just how sensitive the management of diplomats might be. But a protocol could not remain fixed. It had to respond to changing circumstances and political realities, like any ceremonial system. As Protestantism spread, various powers no longer sent diplomats to Rome; new dynastic powers emerging in the 16th century also had to be placed within the ceremonial system. Yet how should the protocols evolve, and what should the relative effects of changes be? More generally, could the pope exercise sufficient power to set diplomatic precedents that might hold sway elsewhere in Europe, not least as a demonstration of his continuing supranational authority? These issues can be illustrated by the Medici as they acquired ducal (first in 1532) and grand-ducal (1569) status.

Hostility to the Medici, as a new princely family, came most acutely from a regional dynastic rival, the ducal Este of Ferrara, who were determined to preserve their precedence. The 1561 decision by the papal Master of Ceremonies to place the Florentine duke

immediately after Savoy and ahead of Ferrara did little to resolve the issue.[27] The relative ceremonial status of the Medici became still more controversial when in February 1570 Cosimo I (1519-74) came in person to pay homage to Pope Pius V (r.1566-72) and receive confirmation of his grand-ducal title, following a suitably magnificent entry. Significantly, the event, commemorated by Etienne Dupérac's engraving in Antonio Lafreri's *Speculum Romanae Magnificentiae* (1573-77), took place in the Sala Regia. An ambassadorial outcry ensued. The imperial ambassador, in particular, fumed that the coronation was a derogation of the emperor's feudal authority over Siena, which in 1559 had been incorporated into Tuscany, and so he withdrew from attending court.

Diplomatic precedence was a key problem with many implications. If a concession was granted on one occasion, might it thereafter set a new protocol? Would such a new precedent consequently become the rule in other courts? Might the act of receiving the Medici in the Sala Regia have signalled the possibility that they were in fact a royal family – something that exacerbated the controversies surrounding the coronation? Subsequent Medici ambassadors tried their luck in Rome and were closely watched by other powers. While they failed to repeat the concession, the ceremonial ripples of the grand-ducal coronation were felt into the 18th century and referenced by Medici ambassadors seeking precedence in other courts, too. As a single event, Cosimo I's coronation demonstrates the profound sensitivity of diplomatic protocol. More importantly for this chapter, it underlines the international

[27] P. Caprei, "Saggio di atti e documenti nella controversia di precedenza tra il duca di Firenze e quello di Ferrara negli anni 1562-1573," *Archivio storico italiano*, vii (1858), 93-116; G. Mondiani, *La questione di precedenza fra il Duca Cosimo I de'Medici e Alfonso II d'Este* (Florence, 1898).

importance of Rome in the geography of European diplomatic practice.[28] Contrary to the historiographical claims about the decline of the papacy as a diplomatic actor, Rome was Europe's most watched and most contested diplomatic court capital during the 16th and 17th centuries.

"Informal" diplomacy

Formally accredited ambassadors, by virtue of their credentials, could expect certain rights and immunities not granted to others, and yet a rigid distinction between "formal" and "informal" diplomacy is problematic. Historians have become more attuned to the different ways in which diplomacy functioned in early modern Europe, which can certainly be applied to Rome and which should provide fertile ground for future research. "Informal diplomacy" might have been conducted by various institutions or individuals, aside from official diplomats. Thus, Rome had a range of representatives who operated in different contexts, often beyond the papal court, on behalf of their home sovereigns or states.[29] We have seen, for example, how "national" churches performed consular functions in the papal capital. Cardinals were also a special category of ambassador. Indeed, during Henry IV of France's reign (1589-1610), French cardinals were sent to reside in Rome with letters of credence and

[28] Osborne, 2007, 1-21.

[29] For a composite monarchy like Spain, this was even more the case, as an ordinary mission might include representatives of different component parts of the monarchy. Giordano, 2008, 1026-30.

often given formal instructions akin to those of more customary diplomats.[30] Sovereigns might garner support from their cardinals and those in receipt of pensions during moments of great political sensitivity, most importantly during conclaves. As princes of the Church, it was incumbent on cardinals to present themselves with dignities appropriate to the presumed standing of their sovereigns and add luster to more formal diplomacy. Contemporaries were often struck by the material splendor of ambassadorial entries into the papal capital and for lavish celebrations organized by ambassadors, which often included supportive cardinals whose own magnificence amplified the events, as contemporary news reports recorded.[31]

Sovereigns might also be given support by national cardinal-protectors, who sometimes operated as ambassadors themselves, albeit with multiple loyalties.[32] As cardinal-protector (of France, 1621-36; of the Holy Roman Empire, 1636-42) and cardinal-prince (son

[30] Barbiche, 2007, 512-13. For the earlier period see F. Bardati, "Between the king and the pope: French cardinals in Rome (1495-1560)," *Urban History*, 37 (2010), 419-33.

[31] Osborne, 2013, 167-190.

[32] J. Wodka, *Zur geschichte der nationalen Protektorate der Kardinäle an der römischen Kurie* (Innsbruck and Leipzig, 1938); O. Poncet, "The cardinal-protectors of the Crowns in the Roman Curia During the First Half of the Seventeenth Century: the Case of France," in G. Signorotto and M. A. Visceglia (eds.) *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700* (Cambridge, 2002), 158-76.

of Duke Carlo Emanuele I of Savoy, r.1580-1630), Maurizio di Savoia (1593-1657) embodied multiple identities and responsibilities, not least in maintaining Savoy's presence in Rome alongside the duchy's formal ambassadorial presence.[33] The cardinal's lavish residence at Palazzo Montegiordano was funded by France, so the Venetian ambassador surmised.[34] Maurizio also played a major role in the magnificent celebrations marking the election of the King of the Romans in early 1637, demonstrating how cardinal-protectors might double-up with resident ambassadors in promoting their sponsors' interests. Outside the residence of the Spanish ambassador, at what is now the Spanish Steps, a tower was constructed from which emerged an equestrian statue of the newly elected king, which was carried, to the sound of trumpets, through the *piazza* by a throng of armed Germans. The cardinal was closely involved in the celebrations in the German Church of S. Maria dell'Anima, before celebrating again at his diaconal church of S. Maria in Via Lata. In front of his residence, temporary architecture was constructed, with images of cities and places captured by the newly elected

[33] See for example, M. Oberli, *Das Mäzenatentum des Prinzen und Kardinals: Maurizio von Savoyen (1593-1657)* (Weimar, 1999); T. Mörschel, "Blaues Blut, roter Hut. Fürstkardinal Maurizio von Savoyen (1595-1648)," in Arne Karsten (ed.), *Jagd nach dem roten Hut. Kardinalskarrieren im baroken Rom* (Gōttingen, 2004), 156-71.

[34] Archivio di Stato, Venice, Dispacci degli Ambasciatori, Roma, filza 88, fols. 420v-21, Zen to the Senate, 23/06/1623.

king. Fires were lit--a staple of public celebration in early modern Europe--while artificial machines were erected, including volcanoes representing Etna and Vesuvius.[35]

The 1637 celebrations for the King of the Romans' election also points to how national communities could be mobilizsed on behalf of their home states and princes. They might provide the stage-hands and the supporting casts in the performances of ambassadorial magnificence. In 1519, for to take one example, the election of Charles I of Spain as the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V was marked by appropriately grand public celebrations in Rome. Cannons were fired, and bonfires lit for two nights, even if, as Venice's ambassador in Rome observed, virtually all the celebrations were orchestrated by the Spanish in the city, supported by the Colonna family. On the second night around 1000 Spaniards, arrayed for battle and bearing torches, were said to have paraded through the streets shouting "emperor and Spain".[36]

The powerful Florentine community in Rome, which had its own confraternities, national church, consulate, and even various legal rights (that made them almost a state

[35] T. Ameyden, *Relatione delle feste fatte in Roma per l'elettione del re de romani* (Rome, 1637); L. Manzini, *Applausi festivi fatti in Roma per l'elezzione di Ferdinando III al regno de'Romani dal sermo princ. Maurizio Card. di Savoia* (Rome, 1637); BAV Urb. Lat. Avvisi, 1105, fols. 31v-32, 07/02/1637.

[36] Calendar of State Papers Venetian 1509-19, 1250.

within a state), put on similarly magnificent displays.[37] As the Medici emerged as a princely dynasty from the bitter internal squabbles in Florence, so the Florentines in Rome were increasingly identified--not always willingly--with their state as performers of princely magnificence. Following the elections of the Medici popes, Leo X (r.1513-21), Clement VII (r.1523-34), and Leo XI (r. 1605), they erected ceremonial arches lauding the Medici and national identity as celebratory elements of their *possessi* (investiture processions). Clement VIII's election in 1592 ironically brought to the throne a member of the Aldobrandini family whose own father had been exiled by the Medici in 1527. While Clement reportedly opposed his appropriation by the Florentines as one of their own, this did not stop their national community from celebrating. Urban VIII's *possesso* in 1623 was marked by the Florentines erecting an arch at the Piazza di Ponte (now redeveloped, this was at one end of the Ponte S. Angelo, opposite the Castel S. Angelo), complete with the Medici arms in honor of the Tuscan-born pope.[38]

Diplomacy in Rome did not stop at palace gates or chapel doors; rather, it was performed also in public spaces and involved a range of actors beyond those formally

[37] Consult, for example, Fosi, 2003, 43-62; Fosi, 1989, 50-70; G. Bruscoli, *Papal Banking in Renaissance Rome: Benvenuto Olivieri and Paul III, 1534-1549* (Bodmin, 2007), Chapter 1.

[38] BAV Urb. Lat. 1093, fol. 865, 22 November 1623; F. Cancellieri, *Storia de' solenni posessi de' sommi pontefici…* (Rome, 1802), 207; R. Ingersoll *The Ritual use of Public Space in Rome* (Unpublished Ph.D, University of California Berkeley, 1985), 201-2.

attached to a diplomatic mission. In this regard, the rivalries between France and Spain were without equal. In April 1597, against a backdrop of international Franco-Spanish conflict, the arrival in Rome of the duke of Luxembourg (*c.*1550-1613) as ambassador of Henry IV signalled the outbreak of violence on the city's streets, as rival French and Spanish supporters took up wooden swords to fight each other.[39] While France and Spain refrained from direct diplomatic contact at times of war, they invariably treated Rome as a proxy battlefield. Ambassadors typically triggered violence, not least as their public ceremonial performances were opportunities for their national communities to demonstrate magnificence and sheer power on Rome's streets. In more violent confrontations, blood was often spilled.

Following the Portuguese revolt of 1640 after 60 years of union with the Spanish crown, the Portuguese predictably wanted other European powers to acknowledge their independence. There was no better way to achieve this than by seeking formal recognition of an ambassador at the papal court, who also would have been observed by representatives of Europe's leading Catholic powers in Rome, again demonstrating Rome's symbolic importance as a diplomatic hub and the performative power of diplomatic practice. The arrival in 1641 of the bishop of Lamego (d. 1644), nephew of the newly installed Portuguese king, was the prelude to extreme violence on the city's streets. Lamego stayed at the French ambassador's residence, and France was more than willing to support Portugal's claims to independence since France and Spain were themselves formally at war. The results were entirely predictable. What has been called the "Battle of S. Maria in Via" was fought on 20 August 1642 as a concerted attempt by the Spanish to scupper official recognition of the Portuguese ambassador. When Lamego took to the street, shots were exchanged, and many died. Peace was only restored days later when the papal nephew, Cardinal Antonio Barberini

[39] BAV Urb. Lat. 1065, Avvisi, 1065, ff. 255v-256, 30/04/1597.

(1607-71), led a troop of cavalry and infantry into the city's streets.[40] Ultimately, the Portuguese ambassador never received his public consistory, as ambassadorial audiences were known. He left, frustrated, in December, prompting the French ambassador likewise to leave court in "disgust".[41] When in 1646 another Portuguese ambassador planned to come to Rome, again with France's support, the Spanish ambassador protested and warned that there would be further disorder in the streets; Pope Innocent X (r.1644-55) mobilized soldiers for the city's protection.[42]

That same year, the duke of Medina de Rioseco (1599-1647), the hereditary Admiral of Castile, formally entered Rome as Spain's extraordinary ambassador. Even before his entry, a fierce dispute flared up with the cardinal-protector of France, Rinaldo d'Este (1618-72), over protocols and precedence. Despite Innocent X's efforts to defuse the situation, matters rapidly spiralled out of control. The diarist Giacinto Gigli (1594-1671) recounts that the streets and houses in the vicinity of the Este residence at Palazzo Aldobrandini swarmed with his militia. The Spanish ambassador, backed by the pro-Spanish Colonna family, did the same. Once he entered the city through the Porta del Popolo, he avoided the direct route along Via del Corso, near where Cardinal d'Este resided, because armed men stood along his

[40] A. Ademollo, *La questione della indipendenza portoghese a Roma dal 1640 al 1670* (Florence, 1878); Gigli, 1994, I, 358-60

[41] Gigli, 1994, I, 372-3.

[42] Gigli, 1994, II, 481.

way. Days later, the Spanish ambassador finally departed his residence at the nearby Palazzo Colonna with an armed guard totalling around 800 and 50 coaches--an increasingly important component of ambassadorial display.[43] Gigli records that people began to mass at Este's residence as the dispute became a public matter of curiosity, when shots were fired, a number of Spanish followers killed, and the Admiral of Castile was left isolated with only his two coaches. Order was eventually restored when the papal infantry and cavalry, along with *sbiri* (cops) and civic guards, took to the streets and city gates.[44] Although the great papal historian Ludwig von Pastor dismissed this as a trifling incident, he was quite wrong.[45] In the microcosm of this ambassadorial conflict involving a range of actors and participants of differing grades of formality and informality, the standing of Spain and France as international powers was at stake.

In conclusion, this essay has focused on a distinction between "formal" and "informal" diplomacy, a categorization that deserves close scrutiny in the Roman setting. What were the delineations between the formal and informal? How did accredited

[43] On the importance of coaches and material culture more generally for ambassadorial magnificence see M. Olin, "Diplomatic Performances and the Applied Arts in Seventeenth-Century Europe," in P. Gillgren and M. Snickare (eds.), *Performativity and Performance in Baroque Rome* (Farnham, 2012), 25-46.

[44] Gigli, 1994, II, 470.

[45] Von Pastor, 1891-1953, XXX, 69.

ambassadors use their missions for personal interest? The German historiographical tradition of micropolitics has raised important questions about the ways papal families interacted with Rome's ambassadorial community, and we have explored how ambassadors might reside in Rome with their families. The study of "diplomacy" in this context is better characterized as social history than a history of high politics. In turn, more work is needed on the multiple impacts ambassadors had on Rome itself, whether these were social, political, or economic. The issues surrounding the diplomatic *quartier*--so problematic in the later 17th century--represent perhaps the most tangible effects of ambassadors, but what about their requirements in terms of daily provisions? We have examined how diplomacy in Rome involved performances on the various stages of the court and city, with diverse performers. Again, this opens up scope for further research by viewing diplomatic practice in Rome as a cooperative venture, where the accredited ambassador was only one of a number of diplomatic actors.

As a court capital and diplomatic hub, Rome was not only comparable to other European court capitals, but was also in some respects archetypal, despite specific challenges faced by the papacy and certain dynamics unique to the Eternal City. Rome did indeed set the standards for diplomatic ceremonial, and for much of the 16th and 17th centuries it remained Europe's most attended, watched, and contested diplomatic space. In this regard, the metaphor of Rome as a theater is entirely apt--from the attempts to regulate diplomatic protocol within the court, to the ceremonial entries of ambassadors, and the celebrations they orchestrated in Rome's public spaces with the support of cardinals and national communities. The onlookers of these diplomatic performances were not just the courtiers or other ambassadors or even Rome's populace who were present at the occasions. Ambassadors knew they were playing to international audiences, and what they did or might achieve in Rome could resonate across Europe and the globe. "Theater of the world" perfectly captures

Rome's place in European diplomacy, and the Eternal City's abiding international importance.